



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/594,100	06/14/2000	Michael Anthony Dean	99-422	7703

32127 7590 03/09/2006

VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.
C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN
600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE
MAILCODE HQEO3H14
IRVING, TX 75038

EXAMINER

HA, LEYNNA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/594,100

Applicant(s)

DEAN, MICHAEL ANTHONY

Examiner

LEYNNA T. HA

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-33 are pending.
2. This is a Final rejection.

Response to Arguments

3. **Applicant's arguments filed December 13, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.**

Gelman teaches an invention that includes self-network address translators (SNAT), one is a source that is for the source gateway and one is a destination that is for the destination gateway (col.4, lines 10-30). The source SNAT is applicant's first address translator and the destination SNAT is applicant's second address translator. Gelman's SNATs are responsible for performing address translation on incoming and outgoing packets so they are routed to their proper destinations (col.8, lines 59-64). The incoming packets are translated back to the (first) source address which means that the outgoing packets was from the source address that was translated into the (second) destination address prior to transmitting to the destination SNAT of the destination gateway (col.3, lines 26-37). Gelman discloses the original addressing information is modified at the first gateway and then the original's addressing is restored at the second gateway (col.3, lines 52-62). Gelman discloses that whether it is the source SNAT of the source Gateway or the

destination SNAT of the destination gateway, the incoming or outgoing packets is translated. On a note, the source gateway or the destination gateway can be the receiving end. The transmitted packets are translated according to the destination's address in order to be able to route the packet to the proper destination and any incoming which is the received packets are translated back to what it was originally in order to know where it came from (col.3, lines 8-19).

As per claim 1, the examiner traverses the argument in regards to Gelman's claim 1 because the claims is elaborated in his specification and that the specification reads on applicant's claimed invention. Hence, whatever else Gelman additionally discusses or claims does not conflict with applicant's limitations. As such the argument regarding "removing the address information from the packets" is merely additional processes to his invention. To further entertain applicant's argument, the process of removing the address information from the packets is an additional process after the packet was received from the source gateway to the destination. In essence, the removal process at the destination's where it does not conflict applicant's limitations. The reason for removing the address information is to associate channel identifier to the packets (col.32, lines 46-49) which is additional steps to identifying the packets that was received once the packet was at the destination gateway. The removal process does not pertain to the source gateway because the removal process occurs at the destination gateway application (col.32, lines 46-48). The packets are first sent from the source

gateway (col.32, lines 41-44) and once the packet is at the destination gateway application, the packets is forwarded to the destination address based on the stored address information associated to the channel identifier (col.32, lines 46-54). Gelman teaches that the received packet is translated back to the source address which read on applicant's claimed invention (col.3, lines 52-62). What happens in addition or after the translation at the receiving end is merely additional measures for Gelman's invention that applicant lacks thereof.

Gelman's relies on WLP, TCP/IP for transmission protocols (col.2, lines 39-43) and performs the protocol translation from TCP to WLP or from WLP to TCP. It doesn't matter what transmission protocol Gelman uses for his invention because applicant fails to limit the type of transmission protocol.

Gelman discloses the original addressing information is modified at the first gateway and then the original's addressing is restored at the second gateway (col.3, lines 52-62). The incoming packets are translated back to the (first) source address which means that the outgoing packets was from the source address that was translated into the (second) destination address prior to transmitting to the destination SNAT of the destination gateway (col.3, lines 26-37). Gelman discloses that whether it is the source SNAT of the source Gateway or the destination SNAT of the destination gateway, the incoming or outgoing packets is translated. Gelman does not disclose the addressing information is separated from the packet during transmission whereas Gelman

does teach that the data packet is transmitted with the second destination address from the source (first) SNAT (col.3, lines 34-38 and col.4, lines 46-56).

Once the source SNAT translates the source address to the destination (second) address, the source gateway transfers the second address to the destination gateway (col.9, lines 8-13 and col.10, lines 10-22). Therefore, Gelman does teach the claimed transmit the data packet with the second destination address to a second address translator (col.3, lines 26-63).

In regards to claims 11 and 16, the examiner have provided recitations to the claimed translating the first address to the second address and transmitting the second address to the second destination translator (COL.3, lines 50-53 and COL.9, lines 19-20). According to column 4, lines 46-51 and column 10, lines 9-11 merely shows that the destination gateway receives the packet which does mean the transmission to the second address translator of the destination gateway. Thereafter, at the destination gateway the packet is then forwarded to the intended destination. Further the processor is inherently needed in order to operate or configure to function. Gelman does disclose the gateway which is a device, therefore a device contains the processor.

As per claims 21, 26, and 31-32; Applicant's arguments are unclear as to what applicant is trying to convey because the topics that are brought up has nothing to do with the claimed invention and bringing certain subject matter from Gelman (i.e. pg.19-20-TCP, WLP, communication protocol) does not

associate to what is claimed and the rejections brought forth. The examiner is confused why applicant fails to see that Gelman does numerous throughout the prior art cite translating addresses in the SNAT. Gelman cited exactly the same wordings like applicant used in the claimed language “address translator” that translates and transmits “addresses” (col.3, lines 27-28). Unless, applicant’s address is different from Gelman’s address, it needs to be claimed or disclosed in the specification.

Gelman discloses the original first addressing information is translated at the first source translator of the source gateway becoming the second destination’s address of the second gateway thereby the second gateway receiving the packet and second address is translated back to the first address at the second gateway (col.3, lines 59-62 and col.9, line 20-30). As in claim 26, the first address is included in the data packet that contains the destination address information (col.17, lines 29-39 and col.19, lines 26-30). Gelman does teach the claimed transmit the data packet with the second destination address to a second address translator (col.3, lines 26-63). The examiner did not associate the source gateway to applicant’s first translator. Gelman discloses SNATs, each one for the source gateway and destination gateway. Therefore, the SNAT of Gelman is an “address translator” that the applicant exactly claims. Gelman discloses the original addressing information is modified at the first gateway and then the original’s addressing is restored at the second gateway (col.3, lines 52-62). The incoming packets are translated

back to the (first) source address which means that the outgoing packets was from the source address that was translated into the (second) destination address prior to transmitting to the destination SNAT of the destination gateway (col.3, lines 26-37). The examiner is also confused of the argument on page 19, where Gelman does teach communication between the first gateway and the second gateway application (col.3, lines 34-38). Column 18 merely shows the tables used to map addresses. The argument regarding “TCP exclusively” that the “is not TCP, but is WLP” is unclear what and why this is relevant to its rejection provided to what is claimed.

Claims 21, 26, and 31-32 does not claim any protocols and should not be brought forth because these claims and broadly claims the first address translates to a second address and transmitting the second address to the second translator which the examiner have provided numerous citations above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gelman, et al. (US 6,415,329).

As per claim 1:

Gelman, et al. disclose in a network including at least one server for communicating with at least one client, a method comprising:

receiving in a first address translator a data packet from a client, the data packet including a first destination address; **(COL.4, lines 32-37 and COL.9, lines 21-26)**

changing the first destination address to a second destination address in the first address translator; **(COL.3, lines 50-53 and COL.9, lines 19-20)**

transmitting the data packet with the second destination address from the first address translator via the network; **(COL.9, lines 24-25)**

receiving in the second address translator the data packet transmitted via the network **(COL.4, lines 46-51 and COL.10, lines 9-11)**

translating the second destination address back to the first destination address in the second address translator; and **(COL.3, lines 59-62 and COL.9, lines 29-30)**

forwarding the data packet from the second address translator to the server using the first destination address. **(COL.3, lines 44-48 and COL.10, lines 12-16)**

As per claim 2: See COL.4, lines 63-65 and COL.15, lines 5-6; discussing encrypting the second destination address before transmitting the data packet.

As per claim 3: See COL.4, lines 63-65; discussing decrypting the second destination address before translating the second destination address.

As per claim 4: See COL.17, lines 28-36 and COL.18, lines 13-22 and lines 34-50; discussing mapping the first destination address to the second destination address using a mapping algorithm.

As per claim 5: See COL.17, lines 28-36 and COL.18, lines 13-22 and lines 34-50; discussing mapping the first port information to second port information.

As per claim 6: See COL.3, lines 59-62 and COL.9, lines 29-30; discussing translating the second port information back to the first port information.

As per claim 7: See COL.17, lines 32-67 and COL.20, lines 8-14; discussing determining whether the first destination address is included in a set of predetermined addresses before changing the first destination address.

As per claim 8: See COL.17, lines 28-36 and COL.18, lines 13-22 and lines 34-50; discusses determining whether the second destination address is included in a set of predetermined addresses before translating the second destination address.

As per claim 9: See COL.17, lines 32-67; discusses determining whether to change the first destination address based on a current time and whether the first address is in a set of predetermined addresses (col.7, lines 4-5 and col.12, lines 53-65).

As per claim 10: See COL.17, lines 32-67 and COL.18, lines 13-22; discusses determining whether to translate the second destination address based on the time and whether the second address is in a set of predetermined address (col.12, lines 53-65).

As per claim 11:

Gelman discloses a system for mapping destination information comprising:

a memory configured to store a mapping algorithm; **(COL.17, lines 28-36 and COL.18, lines 13-22 and lines 34-50)**

a processor configured to:

receive in a first address translator a data packet that includes a first destination address, the first destination address representing a real destination address, **(COL.4, lines 32-37 and COL.9, lines 21-26)**

changing the first destination address to a second destination address in the first address translator (**COL.3, lines 50-53 and COL.9, lines 19-20**) using the mapping algorithm; and (**COL.17, lines 28-36 and COL.18, lines 13-22 and lines 34-50**)

transmit the data packet with the second destination address (**COL.3, lines 34-38**) to a second address translator. (**COL.4, lines 46-51 and COL.10, lines 9-11**)

As per claim 12: See COL.4, lines 63-65 and COL.15, lines 5-6; discusses encrypting the second destination address before transmitting the data packet.

As per claim 13: See COL.17, lines 28-36 and COL.18, lines 13-22 and lines 34-50; discusses mapping the first port information to second port information using a mapping algorithm (col.7, lines 15-50).

As per claim 14: See COL.20, lines 8-14; discusses determining whether the first destination address is included in a set of predetermined addresses before changing the first destination address.

As per claim 15: See COL.17, lines 32-67; discusses determining whether to change the first destination address based on a current time and whether the first address is in a set of predetermined addresses (col.7, lines 4-5 and 44-46).

As per claim 16:

Gelman discloses a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of sequences of instructions, when executed by the processor, causes said processor to perform the steps of:

receiving in the first address translator a data packet including a first destination address, the first destination address representing the real destination address; **(COL.4, lines 32-37 and COL.9, lines 21-26)**

changing the first destination address to a second destination address in the first address translator using a mapping algorithm; and **(col.17, lines 29-39 and col.19, lines 26-30)**

transmitting the data packet with the second destination address to second address translator. **(COL.4, lines 46-51 and col.3, lines 59-62)**

As per claim 17: See COL.4, lines 63-65 and COL.15, lines 5-6; discussing encrypting the second destination address before transmitting the data packet.

As per claim 18: See COL.17, lines 28-36 and COL.18, lines 13-22 and lines 34-50; discussing mapping the first port information to second port information.

As per claim 19: See COL.17, lines 32-67 and COL.20, lines 8-14; discusses determining whether the first destination address is included in a set of predetermined addresses before changing the first destination address.

As per claim 20: See COL.17, lines 32-67 and COL.18, lines 13-22; discusses determining whether to translate the second destination address based on the time and whether the second address is in a set of predetermined address (col.12, lines 53-65).

As per claim 21:

Gelman discloses a system for mapping destination information comprising:

a memory configured to store a mapping algorithm; (**COL.17, lines 28-36 and COL.18, lines 13-22 and lines 34-50**)

a processor configured to:

receive in a first address translator a data packet that includes a first destination address, the first destination address representing a real destination address; (**COL.4, lines 32-37 and COL.9, lines 21-26**)

translate in the second address translator the first destination address to a second destination address using the translation algorithm, the second destination address representing a real destination address, and (**COL.3, lines 50-53 and COL.9, lines 19-20**)

forward the data packet with the second destination address using the second destination address. (**COL.4, lines 46-51 and COL.10, lines 9-11**)

As per claim 22: See COL.4, lines 63-65; discussing decrypting the mapped destination address information concurrently with the translating.

As per claim 23: See COL.3, lines 59-62 and COL.9, lines 29-30; discussing translating the first port information to second port information.

As per claim 24: See COL.17, lines 32-67 and COL.20, lines 8-14; discusses determining whether the first destination address is included in a set of predetermined addresses before translating the first destination address.

As per claim 25: See COL.17, lines 32-67; discusses determining whether to translate the first destination address based on a current time and whether the first address is in a set of predetermined addresses (col.7, lines 4-5 and 44-46).

As per claim 26:

Gelman discloses a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of sequences of instructions, when executed by the processor, cause said processor to perform the steps of:

receiving from a first address translator into a second address translator a data packet including a first destination address, first destination address representing a mapped destination address; **(COL.17, lines 28-36 and COL.18, lines 13-22 and lines 34-50)**

translating the first destination address to a second destination address back in the second address translator using the translation algorithm **(col.17, lines 29-39 and col.19, lines 26-30)**, the second destination address representing a real destination address; and **(COL.3, lines 50-53 and COL.9, lines 19-20)**

forwarding the data packet from the second address using the second destination address. **(COL.4, lines 46-51 and COL.10, lines 9-11)**

As per claim 27: See COL.4, lines 63-65; discussing decrypting the encrypted information before translating the data packet.

As per claim 28: See COL.3, lines 59-62 and COL.9, lines 29-30; discussing translating the first port information to second port information.

As per claim 29: See COL.17, lines 32-67 and COL.20, lines 8-14; discusses determining whether the first destination address is included in a set of predetermined addresses before translating the first destination address.

As per claim 30: See COL.17, lines 32-67; discusses determining whether to translate the first destination address based on a current time and whether the first address is in a set of predetermined addresses (col.7, lines 4-5 and col.12, lines 53-65).

As per claim 31:

Gelman disclose in a network including at least one server for communicating with at least one client, a method comprising:

means for receiving in a first address translator a data packet from a client, the data packet including a first destination address; **(COL.4, lines 32-37 and COL.9, lines 21-26)**

means for changing the first destination address to a second destination address in the first address translator; **(COL.3, lines 50-53 and COL.9, lines 19-20)**

means for transmitting the data packet with the second destination address from the first address translator via the network; **(COL.9, lines 24-25)**

means for receiving in the second address translator the data packet transmitted via the network; **(col.3, lines 59-62 and col.10, lines 9-11)**

means for translating the second destination address back to the first destination address in the second address translator; and **(COL.3, lines 59-62 and COL.9, lines 29-30)**

means for forwarding the data packet from the second address translator to the server using the first destination address. **(COL.3, lines 44-48 and COL.10, lines 12-16)**

As per claim 32:

Gelman disclose in a network including at least one client and at least one server a system comprising:

a first address translator configured to:

receive a data packet from a client, the data packet including a first destination address wherein the first destination address represents the real destination address; **(COL.4, lines 32-37 and COL.9, lines 21-26)**

change the first destination address to a second destination address, and **(COL.3, lines 50-53 and COL.9, lines 19-20)**

transmit the data packet with the second destination address via the network; and **(col.3, lines 59-62 and col.9, line 53-col.10, line 8)**

a second address translator configured to:

receive the data packet transmitted via the network, **(COL.4, lines 46-51 and COL.10, lines 9-11)**

translate the second destination address back to the first destination address, and **(COL.3, lines 59-62 and COL.9, lines 29-30)**

forward the data packet to the server using the first destination address. **(COL.3, lines 44-48 and COL.10, lines 12-16)**

As per claim 33:

Gelman the second address translator further configured to:

receive a reply data packet from the server, the reply data packet including a third destination address wherein the third destination address represents the real destination address, **(COL.10, lines 14-16)**

change the third destination address to a fourth destination address, **(COL.3, lines 50-53 and col.9, line 53-col.10, line 8)**

transmit the reply data packet via the network; and **(COL.9, lines 24-25)**

the second address translator further configured to:

receive the reply data packet transmitted via the network, **(COL.4, lines 46-51 and COL.10, lines 9-11)**

translate the fourth destination address back to the third destination address, and **(COL.3, lines 59-62 and COL.9, lines 29-30)**

forward the data packet to the server using the third destination. **(COL.3, lines 44-48 and COL.10, lines 12-16)**

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEYNNA T. HA whose telephone number is (571) 272-3851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (7:00 - 5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lha



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100